Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE INDUSTRIAL MILLENNIUM.

THE industrial millennium, by which is meant, of course, the industrial ideal, is easily conceived in outline, and not difficult to describe in general terms. It is an industrial condition, in which life is the end of labor and labor is the means of life. Every man is at work in the best way at what he can do best, for the good of all and not for private profit. Labor and capital are at peace, for all are laborers for a common end, and capital is but the means of making the common labor effective. Material resources are husbanded, and labor is employed and directed with but one end in view, the attainment of the maximum quantity and quality of human life.

Is it worth while, however, to consider an industrial ideal so remote as this? What possible interest can the practical man of to-day have in the industrial millennium? A little reflection ought to show that it is not merely worth while but that it is of the utmost importance for us to try to conceive what industrial society ought to be, and what it must become if progress is to continue, and to realize that a rational industrial ideal is one of the most practical things that can engage our thought. The ideal is always practical. It implies a plan. Its attractive power is no less dynamic than the propelling power of circumstances. There are few who do not recognize this in relation to individual action—for instance, in education and in business. Without some ideal there is no aim, and nothing to serve as a standard of comparison. But social ideals are even more practical than individual ideals, since they involve a larger control and direction of energy. The criterion, by which existing social conditions and institutions and every proposed method of social amelioration and reform are to be tested, is some conception of a social ideal. The precision and finality of the test depend upon the scientific accuracy of this conception. Science has therefore no higher or more important function than the formulation, on the basis of existing facts and conditions, of social ideals involving the highest possibilities of life,

and which may be progressively realized. This is especially true, owing to the importance of the economic factor in social development, with respect to industry.

Industrial science, however, has been slow to recognize the legitimacy and importance of this function. Industrial ideals, it is said, are chimerical, Utopian; science should have nothing to do with ideals. But it is just because industrial and social ideals have hitherto been fantastic that science should rescue them from the region of fancy and establish them in the region of fact. Such ideals will always appear and will influence the actions of men. Whether they shall be *ignes fatui,* leading us astray, or beacons set up with care and foresight, science alone can determine. It is folly to say that industrial science should have nothing to do with ideals. What may be industrially is one of the most important objects of thought. It gives the highest significance and consequence to every discovery of what has been. Until an industrial ideal, which from its scientific character will compel general acceptance is formulated, political economy will deserve to some extent the accusation of sterility.

It is then a deplorable fact, due in part to this conception of the limits of science, that as yet we have no generally acceptable and accepted industrial ideal. This lack is the source of inestimable mental perplexity and political and industrial friction. We have so-called individualists and collectivists, anarchists and socialists, with every shade of intermediate opinion, and a consequent confusion of tongues. The dominant political party, for instance, cries "stand pat," "let well enough alone," implying that the majority of voters have no industrial ideal at all, or that the ideal has been already attained. The other great party harks back to an antiquated and now impossible era of free competition. The socialist party, which, whatever we may think of its doctrines, is the only party with anything like a scientific program, has an ideal, to be sure, but it is as yet the ideal of comparatively a few. It may be said, too, that many of the socialists are themselves soenamored of their ideal, that they seem unwilling to take the intervening steps necessary to attain it. We are, in fact, a nation, practically without

an industrial ideal. This fact should awaken anxious solicitude. "Where there is no vision the people perish."

We are, then, wholly within the realms of science, and engaged in a most practical undertaking, when we endeavor to forecast certain broad features of the industrial world as it ought to be. We may begin by asking: What are the hints that may be gathered from industrial evolution and present conditions in regard to the industrial goal towards which conscious efforts at industrial reform should be directed? What is the industrial ideal?

In the first place, it seems indisputable that perfect conditions of industry imply perfect rationality in industrial activities and relations. An industrial condition, in which the end of labor is not the highest conceivable, or in which means are imperfectly adapted to ends, or results disproportionate to efforts, would at once be recognized as a condition capable of improvement, hence not ideal. The industrial ideal must therefore be a rational industrial order. It must be the embodiment of reason.

Reason, however, can manifest itself on the industrial plane only in the character of the objects to be pursued, and in the relation of means to ends. If the ends of industry are not the highest, or if the industrial means for attaining them are not the best, there is *pro tanto* an absence of perfect reason. Reason in industry spells economy. The industrial ideal must perfectly illustrate the principle of the economy of force.

We have now the central idea from which must radiate all true conceptions of industrial relations. It is the idea of economy. The word economy is here used, of course, in the broadest sense. As popularly understood, economy is not always a praiseworthy end. This is because popular thought runs on financial economy. This sometimes becomes niggardliness, penuriousness, stinginess—a false economy. It defeats its highest end. "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." In the broader sense—the social sense—economy means the most effective use of all available resources in the interest of human life. The practical question with reference

to any industrial practice or policy is: What is or will be its effect in the matter of promoting industrial economy? remembering always that the chief element in this economy is not material wealth, but the lives and happiness of men.

Not to make this discussion altogether ideological, however. let us approach the subject from the standpoint of industrial tendencies.

To determine whither the industrial world is tending it is necessary to examine the principles underlying industrial evolution, and to determine which of these principles give promise of becoming dominant. Waste or economy, competitive strife or coöperation, egoism or altruism, love or hate, individualism or collectivism—which of these are the abiding elements in our industrial life? This being ascertained, the industrial ideal ought to be found by tracing these elements or principles to their ultimate effects.

Now, when we look into the evolution of industry or into the business of to-day, the first feature which strikes the eye is the effort of individuals to promote individual economy. Improvement in industry has always been in this direction. Progress in industry has, from one point of view, been the gradual release of human energy from industry. The business man of to-day, for instance, improves his organization, perfects his machinery, utilizes waste products, etc., all for the purpose of promoting economy from the standpoint of his financial interest. The principle of his action is maximum return for minimum expenditure, and that is but the principle of the economy of force. The corporation and the trust illustrate exactly the same thing. Economy is the law of business.

The principle, however, is capable of wider application. It runs through all forms of human activity, all social evolution. Intelligence always seeks the highest return in happiness for energy expended. The evolution of intelligence, individual or social, is characterized by increasing economy. Economy is the law of mind.

As society becomes more conscious and intelligent, then, the more will it demand that individual economies conform to social economy, the complete elimination of industrial waste.

The industrial millennium implies the complete absence of industrial friction, the reduction of labor to that which is socially necessary, and the performance of that labor with the minimum expenditure of energy, that is, perfect industrial economy. This is the goal of industrial evolution.

Such economy, however, is inconceivable without coöperation, for with out the coöperation of men perfect industrial efficiency is manifestly impossible. Moreover, this coöperation must be voluntary. Compulsion would involve a loss of energy in supervision and in the potential service of those who labor under it. Forced labor is never as efficient as free labor.

The industrial millennium, then, can never come until we have the coöperative type of man—the man who can combine with his fellows to promote the common life, the man who will submit to be organized, subordinated and disciplined for the sake of humanity, just as a member of an orchestra, as Amiel has suggested, submits himself to be organized, subordinated and disciplined for the sake of his art and for the sake of producing a masterpiece.

Now we have a ground of hope that such a type of man is coming. The unconscious coöperation of modern industry is gradually developing it. The education of the family, the school and the church tend in the same direction. The trades unions, with all their faults, are developing the spirit of coöperation through their collective efforts for mutual benefit. The spirit of coöperation is the inevitable outcome of friendly association. The man of the future, providing always that progress continues, is not the "Blonde Beast" of Nietzsche, the man of blood and iron, but the man who is wise enough to be simple, strong enough to be inoffensive, and great enough to be humble. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."

Voluntary coöperation implies fellowship, brotherhood, love. The industrial millennium is an ethical, as well as an industrial organization. It must be ethical to be economic, in the real sense of that word. Love is both cause and effect of coöperation. Whatever promotes the one encourages the other. It would be sheer cowardice to avoid the apparent sentimentality

involved in declaring that love is the chief ingredient of the solvent of all industrial problems. There is nothing else that will bring employer and employee together, nothing else that will produce a harmonious industrial order. An industrial millennium cannot be conceived without it. "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law."

But coöperation in the spirit of love is not all that is essential to industrial economy. There must be direction of industrial forces. This direction must be by self-chosen, and consequently irresponsible individuals, or by society itself, acting through elected agents. The former method, the method of to-day, is capable of producing a high economy, but it is not ideal, owing to the multiplicity of ends to be served. The ends of industry must be unified. They must become public instead of private. Ideal economy can come, therefore, only through the application of the democratic principle in the industrial world, as it has already been applied in the political world. The application of the principle, however, is not alone sufficient. Democracy is not an end, but a means. If industry were wholly democratized, economy would still depend upon the degree of administrative capacity shown by popular representatives. A society that will elect boodlers to office, and wink at corruption and graft, imagines a vain thing, if it supposes that the extension of democracy to industry would bring immediate relief from industrial difficulties. The success of democracy, political or industrial, must depend upon the spirit and administrative capacity of men chosen by a majority vote. Education and a high sense of civic responsibility are therefore necessary to make industrial democracy effective.

The drift of industry, then, is toward an ideal economy in which coöperative labor under democratic direction is necessarily implied. This drift, obvious enough now even to the casual observer, will become more and more pronounced as men grasp the ideal here suggested and begin to ask themselves: How shall we act individually and collectively, so as best to forward the realization of this ideal?

Let me condense the argument. The industrial millennium must be a perfectly rational order, otherwise it would not be a

millennium at all. A rational industrial order must manifest itself in industrial economy, which is but the manifestation of reason on the industrial plane. Perfect industrial economy, however, is impossible without voluntary coöperation, which in turn is dependent on the coöperative spirit or love. Finally, the effectiveness, that is, the economy of voluntary coöperative effort depends upon intelligent and unselfish direction of industry, which can be secured ideally only by means of intelligent democratic control. Hence the industrial millennium is a perfected industrial democracy.

The social regulation of industry, then—its progressive socialization, if you please,—is in accord with the principles of evolution, biological and social. It reveals itself in the history of industrial progress. It is demanded by the human spirit which, as it evolves in intelligence and purpose, will more and more seek release from the toil and moil of present industry by humanizing the machine, by doing away with unnecessary labor and by transforming necessary industry into art. This means social organization for the economy of time and energy, and social control for effectiveness. It may mean also a certain sacrifice of initiative by the individual. But what if it does? Industry is not life. If it were, men would do well to resist any movement which might tend to destroy, or even to restrict, individual initiative in the field of toil. Industry is but a phase of life, and by no means the highest phase. It consists of those activities of mind and muscle that are necessary to provide the material means, the physical basis of life. If it can ever be made to assume right relations to life men will gladly surrender individual initiative there, if need be, for the far more necessary and desirable initiative in the higher realms of life.

But before industrial democracy can come, in anything but form, the spirit of democracy must grow. External changes in the industrial environment are necessary. They can do much. But no external change can be permanently effective without moral and psychological changes in men. The industrial millenium implies the principle "all for each and each for all." In how many of us is the spirit of coöperation sufficiently developed to make that the working principle of our

lives? It implies universal brotherhood. How many of us are, in our hearts, a brother to men of all degree and of all color? Sometimes when I hear men advocating, in a spirit of hate, an industrial and social order founded upon love, I wonder if they ever reflect upon their own unfitness for the conditions they seek to promote. The words of Jesus have here a certain application: "Not every one that sayeth Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom; . . . but he that doeth the will." . . . "Many will say in that day: Have we not prophesied in Thy name; and in Thy name done many wonderful works; then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." The industrial millennium is spirit as well as form.

But if the content of the industrial millennium is dependent upon the spirit of men, the spirit is also dependent upon the form. The form must come to give freedom to the spirit, and unless all signs fail, the form is coming. "The great development of industrialism," says President Roosevelt, "means that there must be an increase in the supervision exercised by the government over business enterprises." Where is this supervision to cease? That depends upon your theory of government. If government is an external and a paternal institution higher than the people, then we may well be jealous of its encroachments in the field of industry. But if the people are supreme and government but the agency through which the will of the people is manifested, and accomplished, then a hard and fast line cannot be drawn. For industry, after all, is a social function, and there is no limit to the right of the people to regulate their own activities, and manage their own affairs, except the limit of expediency, and this will vary from time to time. It will gradually extend as popular intelligence and administrative capacity extend. It will extend by leaps and bounds if the greed and insolence of corporations and trusts are not restrained.

At all events the form of industrial democracy is coming. If violently, then woe worth the day! It will mean a reaction that will hurl us backward down the steep declivity up which the race has so slowly and so painfully climbed. But if grad-

ually and peacefully, as men are prepared for it in spirit, intelligence and administrative capacity, it will mean the dawn of a day of progress beyond anything which has entered into our imaginations to conceive. The unresting spirit of man aspiring to become a god, will have broken and cast off the chrysalis if industrial materialism in which work is the end of life, to soar with unfettered wings in the glorious realms of art, where life is the end of work. "Bliss will it be in that dawn to be alive, but to be young will be very heaven."

IRA WOODS HOWERTH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

ETHICAL FORCES IN THE PRACTICE OF MEDICINE.*

WHAT forces are there in the profession of medicine that tend to bring out the best that is in men? I shall mention five:

1. The sense of an obvious utility to others.
2. The inspiration of taking part in the progress of sciences.
3. The call for manual and mental dexterity.
4. The interest of the community in the profession and its aims.
5. The friendly contact with men, women and children.

1. The business of medicine is to get people out of difficulties through the application of science and of dexterity, manual and pyschical. This task appeals at once to some of the strongest of our natural impulses. When we see a man fall in the street we naturally want to help him up. To lend a hand in unharnessing the horse who has slipped down, to lift the baby onto the electric car, to direct the stranger to his destination, are impulses which spring up spontaneously, as soon as we see the need. No sense of duty has to be appealed to.

Now the tasks of medicine are often of this sort. We see an obvious and crying need. The power to help is in our pos-

---

* A paper read before the Harvard Ethical Society.